

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

✓ FILED 11/22/2000  
LODGED ENTERED  
RECEIVED

NOV 21 2000

CAROLE ANNE MCINTYRE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BISHOP L. ROBINSON, et al.,

Defendants.

\* \* \* \* \*

STEPHEN M. JOHNSON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BISHOP L. ROBINSON, et al.,

Defendants.

\* \* \* \* \*

DESMOND MALCOLM,

Plaintiff,

v.

PARRIS GLENDENING, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil No. PJM 95-190

Civil No. PJM 94-2871

Civil No. PJM 98-4109

AT GREENBELT  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
DEPUTY


**ORDER**

For the reasons set forth in the accompanying Opinion, it is this 21st day of

November, 2000

ORDERED:

- 1) Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED;
- 2) Defendants' Supplemental Motion to Dismiss or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART;
- 3) Specifically, Defendants' Supplemental Motion is DENIED as to their liability for declaratory and injunctive relief and as to Plaintiffs' claims for damages based on Plaintiffs' existing medical conditions and the effects of different levels of ETS on those conditions. Defendants' Motion is GRANTED as to Plaintiffs' claims for damages based on the creation of an unreasonable risk of future harm by exposure to ETS;
- 4) All other pending Motions are rendered MOOT.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
PETER J. MESSITTE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE